

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

RLI INSURANCE COMPANY,

Plaintiff,

vs.

FIFTH THIRD BANCORP,

Defendant.

[illegible]

CASE NO. 1:14-cv-00802

Senior Judge Sandra S. Beckwith
Magistrate Judge Stephanie J. Bowman

FIFTH THIRD BANCORP, et al.,

Plaintiff,

VS.

**CERTAIN UNDERWRITERS AT
LLOYDS SUBSCRIBING TO POLICY
NUMBERS B0509QA48710 AND
B0509QA051310, et al.,**

Defendant

1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525

CASE NO. 1:14-cv-00869

Senior Judge Sandra S. Beckwith
Magistrate Judge Stephanie J. Bowman

ORDER

Before the Court are Fifth Third's Objections (Doc. No. 64) to the Memorandum Order of the Magistrate Judge (Doc. No. 62). Continental Insurance Company, Fidelity and Deposit Insurance Company of Maryland, and St. Paul Mercury Insurance Company (collectively the

“Second Excess Insurance Carriers”) have joined in Fifth Third’s opposition to responses and replies and this matter is ripe for review. For the reasons set forth below, this Court finds that the Magistrate’s order is not clearly erroneous or contrary to law and, therefore, Fifth Third’s objections are denied in part, as ordered and recommended by the Magistrate.

BACKGROUND

The above two cases have been consolidated for purposes of discovery and pre-trial proceedings, without prejudice to any future motion to consolidate for trial. (Case No. 802, Doc. No. 27; Case No. 869, Doc. No. 33). The basis of the subject ruling are two motions relating to pretrial proceedings: 1) Defendants’ Sealed Motion for Protective Order or to Stay Discovery and Bifurcate Plaintiff’s “Bad Faith Claim” in Case No. 14-cv-869 and 2) Plaintiff RLI’s Motion for Joinder in Certain Underwriters’ Motion for Protective Order and in the Alternative to Stay and Bifurcate Plaintiffs’ “Bad Faith Claim” on Case No. 14-cv-802.

This Court has reviewed the record for both cases, as well as all underlying motions, exhibits, responses, replies and the ensuing objections. It is evident that Magistrate Bowman has thoroughly set forth the facts and procedural posture of this matter in her Report and Recommendation. Therefore, in the interests of brevity, only a summary is provided here.

The claims herein arise from the actions of a Fifth Third loan officer who was formerly employed in the bank’s structured finance group. Fifth Third alleges it suffered significant losses, in excess of \$100 million, due to the loan officer’s actions, which exceed the policy limits of all the financial bonds issued by the various entities. (Doc. No. 62). Allegations of breach of contract and bad faith, as well as questions concerning the extent of coverage, emerge from this

conduct and provide the backdrop for this matter. Bad faith has not been pleaded as a separate tort, however.

The first matter was filed by RLI Insurance Company (“RLI”), one of several insurers involved in a financial bond policy issued to Fifth Third Bancorp (“Fifth Third”). RLI seeks a declaratory judgment, Case No. 1:14-cv-802, finding that RLI is not obligated under the policy because it claims that Fifth Third was aware of the loss prior to the purchase of the bond and failed to present its claim timely. Fifth Third then filed Case No. 1:14-cv-869 against several other insurers that also issued and/or participated in additional financial bonds purchased by Fifth Third, and under which Fifth Third seeks to recover. Id.

The Defendants in Case No. 14-cv-869 filed a motion seeking a protective order or, in the alternative, to stay discovery and bifurcate Plaintiff’s bad faith claim. (Case No. 1:14-cv-869, Doc. No. 53). Plaintiff RLI filed a similar motion and requested to join the Defendants’ motion. (Case No. 1:14-cv-802, Doc. No. 44). The concomitant responses and replies have been filed as well. (Case No. 1:14-cv-802, Docs. No. 49, 60). For the purposes of this Order, the moving parties are referred to collectively as “the Insurers.”

ANALYSIS

The Insurers specifically seek to stay and bifurcate as to discovery of privileged attorney-client materials, work product materials, and claims file materials. The Insurers assert that it will impede their defense of the potential bad faith claim and will extend already lengthy discovery in regard to claims that may become moot.

Fifth Third opposes these motions claiming that it is prejudicial to them to stay any further discovery as to the bad faith claim because significant discovery has already transpired

under previously agreed upon discovery parameters. Fifth Third further claims that the Magistrate's order is contrary to law because it does not make a finding pursuant to the factors of Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(b), as applied to Fifth Third.

Following a thorough and detailed review of the law and record, the Magistrate Judge recommended that the Insurers' motions to bifurcate and stay discovery be granted in part and denied in part. The order granted the motions to stay and/or bifurcate discovery on the bad faith issues until at least the filing of any dispositive motions on the underlying breach of contract claims. The Magistrate's order further stated that the issue of whether to bifurcate any bad faith issue for purposes of trial is reserved for the presiding trial judge, to allow for the consideration of any dispositive motions on the underlying breach of contract claims.

This issue is governed by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(b), which places the decision as to whether or not to bifurcate within the discretion of the court. The rule provides that a court may bifurcate a matter "in the furtherance of convenience or to avoid prejudice" or when separation will be conducive to judicial economy. In re Bendectin Litigation, 857 F. 2d 290, 307 (6th Cir.1988). The Magistrate herein analyzed the facts of this matter under this standard and concluded that in the interests of convenience, avoidance of prejudice and judicial economy, this matter should be bifurcated as to discovery, leaving the option to reconsider whether bifurcation is needed until after dispositive motions have been decided. This Court has reviewed the record and finds that the Magistrate's factual analysis is accurate.

Moreover, review of the record reveals that the Magistrate applied and analyzed the facts under the appropriate standard of law to determine whether bifurcation would further the purposes of Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(b).

In a non-dispositive order entered by a magistrate judge, a district court shall consider objections thereto and shall modify or set aside any portion of the magistrate's order it finds to be clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). A finding is clearly erroneous when it leaves the reviewing court "with a definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been made." Heights Community Congress v. Hilltop Realty, Inc., 774 F.2d 135, 140 (6th Cir. 1985). The clearly erroneous standard only requires the reviewing court to decide if there is any evidence to support the magistrate's finding; it is not to substitute its own conclusion for that of the magistrate judge. Id.

This Court finds that the order of the Magistrate Judge was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. Therefore, Fifth Third's objections to the Report and Recommendation are OVERRULED and the Memorandum Order is AFFIRMED, with the following amendment that the stay related to Fifth Third's bad faith allegations is extended until the filing of any dispositive motions.

SO ORDERED.

DATED: December 29, 2016.

s/ Sandra S. Beckwith
Sandra S. Beckwith, Senior Judge
United States District Court